Improved statistical fluctuation analysis for measurement-device-independent quantum key distribution with three-intensity decoy-state method

Zong-Wen Yu[1,2], Yi-Heng Zhou[1,3], and Xiang-Bin Wang[1,3,4*†]
[1] *State Key Laboratory of Low Dimensional Quantum Physics, Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, Peoples Republic of China*
[2] *Data Communication Science and Technology Research Institute, Beijing 100191, China*
[3] *Synergetic Innovation Center of Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*
[4] *Shandong Academy of Information and Communication Technology, Jinan 250101, Peoples Republic of China*

arXiv:1410.3265v2 [quant-ph] 26 Jan 2015

We present an improved statistical fluctuation analysis for measurement device independent quantum key distribution with three-intensity decoy-state method. Taking the statistical fluctuations for different sources jointly, we present more tightened formulas for some key quantities used in calculating the secure final key. Numerical simulation shows that, given the total number of pulses 10^{12}, our method improves the key rate by about 97% for a distance of 50kms compared with the result given by Xu., et al. (Phys. Rev. A 89, 052333); and improves the key rate by 146% for a distance of 100kms compared with the result from full optimization of all parameters but treating the statistical fluctuations traditionally, i.e., treating the fluctuations for different sources separately.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 42.81.Gs, 03.67.Hk

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum key distribution (QKD) is one of the most successful applications of quantum information processing. QKD can provide unconditional security based on the laws of quantum physics [1, 2]. However, due to the imperfections in real-life implementations of QKD, a large gap between its theory and practice remains unfilled. Security for real set-ups of QKD [1, 2] has become a major problem in this area. The major imperfectitons in practical QKD are imperfect single-photon source and the limited efficiency of the detectors. Fortunately, by using the decoy-state method [3–13], it has been shown that the unconditional security of QKD can still be assured with an imperfect single-photon source [14, 15]. The limited detection efficiency is another threaten to the security [16]. To patch up this, several approaches have been proposed, including the so called device independent QKD (DI-QKD) [17] and the measurement-device independent QKD (MDI-QKD) which was based on the idea of entanglement swapping [18, 19]. The key idea of MDI-QKD is that both legitimate users, Alice and Bob, are senders. Neither Alice nor Bob performs any measurement, they only send out quantum signals to the untrusted third party (UTP), who is supposed to perform a Bell state measurement to each pulse pairs. After Alice and Bob send out signals, they wait for UTP's announcement of weather he has obtained a successful event after detection, and proceed to the standard postprocessing of their sifted data. By using the decoy-state method, Alice and Bob can use imperfect single-photon sources [19–21] securely in the MDI-QKD. Hence, the decoy-state MDI-QKD can remove all detector side-channel attacks with imperfect single-photon sources. Because of these important advantages, the decoy-state MDI-QKD has been studied extensively both experimentally [22–24] and theoretically [20, 25–36].

As is well known, in any real experiment, the key size is finite and we have to consider the effect of statistical fluctuations caused by a finite key size. Such an analysis is crucial to ensure the security of MDI-QKD hence it has drawn much attentions [25–27, 30, 36]. Though a non-zero secure key with statistical fluctuations is proven, the key rate value is rather limited. In all these works, the statistical fluctuations of each sources are considered separately. Relations among the statistical fluctuation of different sources are not considered. Actually, as shown in this paper, the relationship among statistical fluctuations of different sources takes an important role in the key rate improvement. By considering them jointly, we obtain more tightened bounds of s_{11}^Z and e_{11}^X which lead to a much higher key rate.

In what follows, we shall first review the decoy-state MDI-QKD for both asymptotic results and non-asymptotic results, and then show our main idea for the improvement through considering the fluctuations of different sources jointly in the first part of section III. In the second part of section III, we systematically present our improved statistical fluctuation analysis by introducing relations among the fluctuations of different sources. We then present the numerical simulation results in section IV. The article is ended with a concluding remark.

*Email Address: xbwang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn
†Also a member of Center for Atomic and Molecular Nanosciences at Tsinghua University

II. THREE-INTENSITY DECOY-STATE METHOD FOR MDI-QKD

In the MDI-QKD protocol, each time a pulse-pair (two-pulse state) is sent to the relay for detection. The relay is controlled by an UTP. The UTP will announce whether the pulse-pair has caused a successful event. Those bits corresponding to successful events will be post-selected and further processed for the final key. Since in practice only imperfect single-photon sources are available, we need the decoy-state method for security in practice.

In the three-intensity decoy-state protocol, we assume Alice (Bob) has three different sources, say o_A, x_A, y_A (o_B, x_B, y_B) which can only emit three different states in photon number space $\rho_{o_A} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$, $\rho^{\omega}_{x_A}$, $\rho^{\omega}_{y_A}$ ($\rho_{o_B} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$, $\rho^{\omega}_{x_B}$, $\rho^{\omega}_{y_B}$) respectively, where the superscript indicates the basis information, $\omega = X$ for X basis and $\omega = Z$ for Z basis. We denote

$$\rho^{\omega}_{x_A} = \sum_k a^{\omega}_k |k\rangle\langle k|, \qquad \rho^{\omega}_{y_A} = \sum_k a'^{\omega}_k |k\rangle\langle k|, \tag{1}$$

$$\rho^{\omega}_{x_B} = \sum_k b^{\omega}_k |k\rangle\langle k|, \qquad \rho^{\omega}_{y_B} = \sum_k b'^{\omega}_k |k\rangle\langle k|, \tag{2}$$

where a^{ω}_k, a'^{ω}_k, b^{ω}_k and b'^{ω}_k are nonnegative parameters. We shall consider the decoy-state method in each basis separately. For simplicity, we shall omit the superscripts ω in what follows of this article provided that the omission does not cause any confusion. In particular, since we assume to implement the decoy-state method in each bases, when we say any source lr, we always mean source lr in a certain basis ω. We request the states above satisfy the following very important condition

$$\frac{a'_k}{a_k} \geq \frac{a'_2}{a_2} \geq \frac{a'_1}{a_1}, \quad \frac{b'_k}{b_k} \geq \frac{b'_2}{b_2} \geq \frac{b'_1}{b_1}, \tag{3}$$

for $k \geq 2$ so that the decoy-state results can apply[20]. Imperfect sources used in practice such as the coherent state source, the heralded source out of the parametric-down conversion, satisfy the above conditions.

At each time, Alice (Bob) randomly chooses source l_A (r_B) with probability p_{l_A} (p_{r_B}). Conditional on this source selection, she (he) chooses basis ω with probability $p_{\omega|l_A}$ ($p_{\omega|r_B}$). Here $l = o, x, y$ ($r = o, x, y$). The pulse from Alice and the pulse from Bob form a pulse pair and are sent to UTP. We regard equivalently that each time a two-pulse source is selected and a pulse pair (one pulse from Alice, one pulse from Bob) is emitted. For postprocessing, Alice and Bob evaluate the data sent in two bases separately. The Z-basis is used for key generations, while the X-basis is used for testing against tampering and the purpose of quantifying the amount of privacy amplification needed. Here, we use the capital letters $Z(X)$ for the bases and the lowercase letters o, x, y for the different sources. Here and after, we omit the subscripts A and B provided that this does not cause any confusions.

A. Asymptotic case

As shown in Ref.[20], we denote lr as the two-pulse source when Alice uses source l and Bob uses r, and l, r can take o, x, y. For example, two-pulse source oy denote the case when Alice use vacuum source o and Bob uses the signal source y. There are nine two-pulse sources lr in each bases of the three-intensity protocol. We also denote S_{lr} as the yield of two-pulse source lr (in a certain basis, X or Z). S_{lr} are observed values and will be regarded as known values here. However, the yields s^{lr}_{mn} for the two-pulses states $|m\rangle\langle m| \otimes |n\rangle\langle n|$ out of source lr cannot be directly observed. In the asymptotic case, we assume that s^{lr}_{mn} for all lr are the same and we can denote all of them by s_{mn}, i.e.

$$s^{lr}_{mn} = s_{mn}, \tag{4}$$

for all $l, r = o, x, y$. Given this, we can formulate the very important unknown variable s_{11} by using relations

$$S_{lr} = \sum_{m,n} c^{lr}_{mn} s_{mn}, \tag{5}$$

if the state for the two-pulse source lr is

$$\rho_{lr} = \sum_{m,n} c^{lr}_{mn} |m\rangle\langle m| \otimes |n\rangle\langle n|. \tag{6}$$

In order to calculate the secret final key rate of this protocol, we need the lower bound of the yield s_{11} and the upper bound of the error rate e_{11}. In Ref. [20], Wang presented the first explicit formula for the practical decoy-state implementation through using part of the above constraints given by Eq.(5), sources $lr(l, r = o, x, y)$ except xy and yx. Without losing the generality, we assume $K_a = \frac{a'_1 b'_2}{a_1 b_2} \leq \frac{a'_2 b'_1}{a_2 b_1} = K_b$. Then the lower bound of s_{11} can be estimated by the following explicit formula [20]

$$\underline{\hat{s}}^{(1)}_{11} = \frac{\hat{S}^{(1)}_{+} - \hat{S}^{(1)}_{-}}{a_1 a'_1 \tilde{b}_{12}}, \tag{7}$$

where $\tilde{b}_{12} = b_1 b'_2 - b'_1 b_2$, $\hat{S}^{(1)}_{+} = \mathcal{S}^{(1)}_{+}(S_{xx}, S_{oy}, S_{yo}, S_{oo})$ and $\hat{S}^{(1)}_{-} = \mathcal{S}^{(1)}_{-}(S_{yy}, S_{ox}, S_{xo})$ with functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^{(1)}_{+}(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) &= a'_1 b'_2 z_1 + a_1 b_2 a'_0 z_2 + a_1 b_2 b'_0 z_3 \\ &\quad + (a'_1 b'_2 a_0 b_0 - a_1 b_2 a'_0 b'_0) z_4, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$\mathcal{S}^{(1)}_{-}(z_1, z_2, z_3) = a_1 b_2 z_1 + a'_1 b'_2 a_0 z_2 + a'_1 b'_2 b_0 z_3. \tag{9}$$

Furthermore, in the case of $K_a > K_b$, the lower bound of s_{11} can be calculated with Eq.(7) by making the exchange between a_k and b_k, and the exchange between a'_k and b'_k for $k = 1, 2$.

Besides this formula, we also present another formula to estimate the lower bound of s_{11} for this three-intensity protocol [31], through using another part of constraints given by Eq.(5), i.e., the constraints for sources $lr(l, r =$

o, x, y) except yy. Explicitly, the lower bound of s_{11} can be estimated by the following explicit formula

$$\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)} = \frac{\hat{S}_{+}^{(2)} - \hat{S}_{-}^{(2)}}{a_1 b_1 \tilde{a}_{12} \tilde{b}_{12}}, \tag{10}$$

where $\tilde{a}_{12} = a_1 a_2' - a_1' a_2$, $\tilde{b}_{12} = b_1 b_2' - b_1' b_2$, $\hat{S}_{+}^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}_{+}^{(2)}(S_{xx}, S_{oy}, S_{yo}, S_{oo})$ and $\hat{S}_{-}^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}_{-}^{(2)}(S_{xy}, S_{yx}, S_{ox}, S_{xo})$ with

$$\mathcal{S}_{+}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = g_{xx} z_1 + g_{oy} z_2 + g_{yo} z_3 + g_{oo} z_4, \tag{11}$$
$$\mathcal{S}_{-}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) = g_{xy} z_1 + g_{yx} z_2 + g_{ox} z_3 + g_{xo} z_4, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{xx} &= a_1 a_2' b_1 b_2' - a_1' a_2 b_1' b_2, \quad g_{xy} = b_1 b_2 \tilde{a}_{12}, \\
g_{yx} &= a_1 a_2 \tilde{b}_{12}, \quad g_{oy} = a_0 g_{xy}, \quad g_{yo} = b_0 g_{yx}, \\
g_{oo} &= a_0 b_0 g_{xx} - a_0 b_0' g_{xy} - a_0' b_0 g_{yx} \\
&= a_0 b_2 \tilde{a}_{12} \tilde{b}_{01} + b_0 a_1 \tilde{a}_{02} \tilde{b}_{12}, \\
g_{ox} &= a_0 g_{xx} - a_0' g_{yx} = a_1 \tilde{a}_{02} \tilde{b}_{12} + a_0 b_1' b_2 \tilde{a}_{12}, \\
g_{xo} &= b_0 g_{xx} - b_0' g_{xy} = b_0 a_1 a_2' \tilde{b}_{12} + b_2 \tilde{a}_1 \tilde{b}_{01}.
\end{aligned}$$

In above equations, we denote $\tilde{a}_{02} = a_0 a_2' - a_0' a_2$ and $\tilde{b}_{01} = b_0 b_1' - b_0' b_1$. With the conditions listed in Eq.(3), we can easily prove that $g_{lr} \geq 0$ for all $l, r = o, x, y$.

As discussed in Ref. [31], we know that the lower bound $\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)}$ is always better than $\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(1)}$ in the asymptotic case. Whereas, in the non-asymptotic case, we need reanalysis the relation between them. Actually, the priority of $\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)}$ will disappear in the case of reasonable data-size for a long enough key distribution distance.

Besides the lower bound of s_{11}, we can estimate the upper bound of e_{11} with the following explicit formula

$$\hat{\bar{e}}_{11} = (\hat{T}_{+} - \hat{T}_{-})/(a_1 b_1 \underline{\hat{s}}_{11}), \tag{13}$$

where

$$\hat{T}_{+} = T_{xx} + a_0 b_0 T_{oo}, \quad \hat{T}_{-} = a_0 T_{ox} + b_0 T_{xo}, \tag{14}$$

and $\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}$ is the lower bound of s_{11} which can be estimated by using Eq.(10).

B. Non-asymptotic case

In any real experiment, the total pulses sent by Alice and Bob are finite. So the number of sifted keys is always finite. In order to extract the secure final key, we have to consider the effect of statistical fluctuations caused by the finite-size key. In the non-asymptotic case, yields of the same two-pulse state out of different sources are not always equal to each other rigorously. That is to say, we need treat them *differently*, i.e.,

$$s_{mn}^{lr} \neq s_{mn}^{l'r'}, \tag{15}$$

for different two-pulse sources lr and $l'r'$ ($lr \neq l'r'$). For example, for two-pulse sources xx and xy, we have $s_{mn}^{xx} \neq s_{mn}^{xy}$ from Eq.(15) with $lr = xx$ and $l'r' = xy$. In such a case, there are too many variants $\{s_{mn}^{lr} | m, n \geq 0; l, r = o, x, y\}$. To obtain the lower bound value for s_{11} and the upper bound value for e_{11}, one can implement the idea of Ref.[13], i.e., treating the averaged yield of a specific state from different sources. As was shown there [13], in the BB84 decoy-state method, one can introduce the averaged value for the yield of an m-photon state from all sources in the same basis. The same idea can obviously apply for the decoy-state method MDI-QKD, i.e., treat these variants s_{mn}^{lr} uniformly by introducing the mean values. Accordingly, define $\langle s_{mn} \rangle$ as the mean value of yield of state $|mn\rangle$ produced by all sources used in the decoy-state method (in a certain basis),

$$\langle s_{mn} \rangle = \sum_{lr} p_l p_r c_{mn}^{lr} s_{mn}^{lr}. \tag{16}$$

Based on this, we can also *define* quantity

$$\langle S_{lr} \rangle = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} c_{mn}^{lr} \langle s_{mn} \rangle. \tag{17}$$

Replacing S_{lr} by $\langle S_{lr} \rangle$ in Eq.(5), we can formulate the lower bound of $\langle s_{11} \rangle$. Note that even though S_{lr} are known values directly observed in an experiment, $\langle S_{lr} \rangle$ are not. However, given the values S_{lr} and N_{lr}, we have

$$\langle S_{lr} \rangle = S_{lr} \left(1 + \delta_{lr}\right). \tag{18}$$

With a probability larger than $1 - \epsilon$, δ_{lr} is in the range of

$$|\delta_{lr}| \leq n_\delta \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{lr} S_{lr}}} \triangleq \overline{\delta}_{lr}, \tag{19}$$

where N_{lr} is the number of pulses sent out by Alice and Bob when they use sources l and r respectively, n_δ is the number of standard deviations one chooses for statistical fluctuation analysis with the given security bound. With these notations, we know that $N_{lr} S_{lr}$ is the number of successful event announced by UTP when Alice and Bob use sources l and r respectively.

In Ref.[13], n_δ is set to be 10. Here in this paper we shall set

$$n_\delta = 5.3, \tag{20}$$

which corresponds to $\epsilon = 10^{-7}$[30, 36] in our numerical simulation, so as to make a fair comparison with [36]. Therefore, we can formulate the lower bound value of $\langle s_{11} \rangle$ by $\langle S_{lr} \rangle$.

In order to get a reasonable lower bound of s_{11} in the non-asymptotic case, we reconsider the explicit formulas Eq.(7) first. As discussed above, in the non-asymptotic case, the observed values are different from its mean values. So we need to replace S_{lr} by its mean values $\langle S_{lr} \rangle$

defined in Eq.(18). Then the formula turns into a function of quantities δ_{lr}.

In the security proof, we assume that Eve can do anything except to violate rules of the nature. In order to obtain a reasonable estimation of the lower bound of s_{11}, we should find out the worst case under the constraints about δ_{lr} given by Eq.(19). If one simply treats all δ_{lr} separately, the worst case result is

$$\underline{s}_{11}^{(1)} = \frac{\underline{S}_{+}^{(1)} - \overline{S}_{-}^{(1)}}{a_1 a_1' \tilde{b}_{12}}, \tag{21}$$

where $\underline{S}_{+}^{(1)} = \mathcal{S}_{+}^{(1)}(\underline{S}_{xx}, \underline{S}_{oy}, \underline{S}_{yo}, \underline{S}_{oo})$, $\overline{S}_{-}^{(1)} = \mathcal{S}_{-}^{(1)}(\overline{S}_{yy}, \overline{S}_{ox}, \overline{S}_{xo})$ with $\mathcal{S}_{+}^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{S}_{-}^{(1)}$ being defined in Eqs.(8,9) respectively, and

$$\underline{S}_{lr} = S_{lr}(1 - \overline{\delta}_{lr}), \quad \overline{S}_{lr} = S_{lr}(1 + \overline{\delta}_{lr}). \tag{22}$$

for all $l, r = o, x, y$. In above equations, $\overline{\delta}_{lr}$ is the upper bound of the δ_{lr} given by Eq.(19).

Besides this lower bound, we can also obtain the other one from Eq.(10) in the same way. Explicitly, we have

$$\underline{s}_{11}^{(2)} = \frac{\underline{S}_{+}^{(2)} - \overline{S}_{-}^{(2)}}{a_1 b_1 \tilde{a}_{12} \tilde{b}_{12}}, \tag{23}$$

where $\underline{S}_{+}^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}_{+}^{(2)}(\underline{S}_{xx}, \underline{S}_{oy}, \underline{S}_{yo}, \underline{S}_{oo})$, $\overline{S}_{-}^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}_{-}^{(2)}(\overline{S}_{xy}, \overline{S}_{yx}, \overline{S}_{ox}, \overline{S}_{xo})$ with $\mathcal{S}_{+}^{(2)}$, $\mathcal{S}_{-}^{(2)}$ being defined in Eqs.(11,12) respectively, $\underline{S}_{lr}$ and $\overline{S}_{lr}$ being defined in Eq.(22).

In Ref. [31], we have shown that the lower bound $\hat{\underline{s}}_{11}^{(2)}$ is always better than $\hat{\underline{s}}_{11}^{(1)}$ with the same experimental parameters in the asymptotic case. However, in the non-asymptotic case, the lower bound $\underline{s}_{11}^{(1)}$ can be better than $\underline{s}_{11}^{(2)}$ in the case of reasonable data-size for a long enough key distribution distance. So we should choose the bigger one. Explicitly, we define the new lower bound of s_{11} for this three-intensity protocol as follows

$$\underline{s}_{11} = \max\{\underline{s}_{11}^{(1)}, \underline{s}_{11}^{(2)}\}, \tag{24}$$

where $\underline{s}_{11}^{(1)}$ and $\underline{s}_{11}^{(2)}$ are defined in Eq.(21) and Eq.(23) respectively.

Similarly, one can also work out the averaged value of $\langle e_{11} \rangle$ by $\langle T_{lr} \rangle$ with

$$\langle T_{lr} \rangle = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} c_{mn}^{lr} \langle s_{mn} \rangle \langle e_{mn} \rangle, \tag{25}$$

being the error yields. Here in Eq.(25), we define the mean value $\langle s_{mn} \rangle \langle e_{mn} \rangle = \sum_{lr} p_l p_r c_{mn}^{lr} s_{mn}^{lr} e_{mn}^{lr}$. By introducing the relative fluctuations τ_{lr}, we can write the relation between error yields $\langle T_{lr} \rangle$ and the observed value T_{lr} as follows

$$\langle T_{lr} \rangle = T_{lr}(1 + \tau_{lr}), \tag{26}$$

for all $l, r = o, x, y$. Similarly, after giving the security bound, τ_{lr} can be bounded by

$$|\tau_{lr}| \leq n_\tau \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{lr} T_{lr}}} \triangleq \overline{\tau}_{lr}, \tag{27}$$

where n_τ is the number of standard deviations one chooses for statistical fluctuation analysis with the given security bound, $N_{lr} T_{lr}$ is the error count when Alice and Bob use sources l and r respectively.

In this three-intensity protocol, we can use the following explicit formula to estimate the upper bound of e_{11}

$$\overline{e}_{11} = (T_+ - T_-)/(a_1 b_1 \underline{s}_{11}), \tag{28}$$

where

$$T_+ = \overline{T}_{xx} + a_0 b_0 \overline{T}_{oo}, \quad T_- = a_0 \underline{T}_{ox} + b_0 \underline{T}_{xo}, \tag{29}$$

with $\underline{s}_{11}$ being the lower bound of s_{11} which can be estimated by using Eq.(24) and

$$\underline{T}_{lr} = T_{lr}(1 - \overline{\tau}_{lr}), \quad \overline{T}_{lr} = T_{lr}(1 + \overline{\tau}_{lr}). \tag{30}$$

In the above equations, $\overline{\tau}_{lr}$ is the upper bound of τ_{lr} defined in Eq.(27).

Here in this work, instead of using this simple worst-case calculation [36], we propose a more efficient method to treat the statistical fluctuations in the decoy-state MDI-QKD. In our method, *we don't have to consider the fluctuation of each quantities separately.* For example, in estimating the quantity T_- in Eq.(29), in a symmetric protocol where $a_0 = b_0$, we need to calculate bound of $T_{ox} + T_{xo}$. The simple worst-case result would calculate the worst-case fluctuation for T_{xo} and T_{ox} *separately.* However, we can treat this more efficiently by considering the statistical fluctuations *jointly.* Say, we regard sources ox and xo as one source $ox + xo$ which emits state $\frac{1}{2}(\rho_{ox} + \rho_{xo})$. For such a source, the error yield $T_{xo} + T_{ox} = 2T_{ox+xo}$. We then only need to consider the fluctuation for only *one* quantity T_{ox+xo}. This will improve the performance of the decoy-state protocol. In the next section we present a systematic study of this joint constraints in the statistical fluctuation.

III. IMPROVED STATISTICAL FLUCTUATION ANALYSIS

In order to estimate the lower bound of s_{11} and the upper bound of e_{11}, we need the values of yields S_{lr} and error yields T_{lr} ($l, r = o, x, y$ for this three-intensity decoy-state protocol), which can be observed in experiment. On the other hand, in any real experiment, we have to consider the effect of statistical fluctuation caused by a finite-size key. As discussed above, we need to introduce quantities δ_{lr} and τ_{lr} to obtain the values of yields $\langle S_{lr} \rangle$ and error yields $\langle T_{lr} \rangle$ with its observed values S_{lr} and T_{lr}. With a given security bound, we can bound δ_{lr} and τ_{lr}, such as the relations presented in Eq.(19) and Eq.(27).

In all previous works, the all fluctuations δ_{lr} for different lr are treated separately and independently and so do all quantities of τ_{lr} for different lr. In this section, we will introduce some relations among them first. With these relations, we then present improved formulas to estimate the lower bound of s_{11} and the upper bound of e_{11} which lead to a much higher rate in distilling the secure final key.

A. Relations among the fluctuations of different sources

When we do the statistical fluctuation analysis, we need to choose a proper security bound first. With a given definite security bound, we can bound δ_{lr} and τ_{lr} by Eq.(19) and Eq.(27) respectively. In order to obtain the relations among these quantities, we need to reconsider the grouping of the successful events announced by UTP.

For clarity, we consider the relation between τ_{ox} and τ_{xo} first. As defined above, we know that τ_{ox} and τ_{xo} are the relative fluctuations for the observed error yields T_{ox} and T_{xo} respectively. These two observable are corresponding to the successful events with different two-pulse sources ox and xo. If we group all those successful events of these two sources together, and denote $J = \{ox, xo\}$, the relation between the error yield T_J and its mean value $\langle T_J\rangle$ is

$$\langle T_J\rangle = T_J(1+\tau_J), \tag{31}$$

where τ_J is the relative fluctuation for the observable T_J. Similarly, τ_J has the following property with given security bound

$$|\tau_J| \leq \frac{n_\tau}{\sqrt{N_{ox}S_{ox}+N_{xo}S_{xo}}} \triangleq \bar{\tau}_J. \tag{32}$$

In this relation, $N_{ox}S_{ox}+N_{xo}S_{xo}$ is the number of error counts when Alice and Bob use two-pulse sources ox and xo. Reconsidering the definition of T_J, we know that

$$N_{ox}T_{ox}+N_{xo}T_{xo} = (N_{ox}+N_{xo})T_J.$$

Now we take into account the mean values. The above relation can be written into

$$\begin{aligned} & N_{ox}\langle T_{ox}\rangle + N_{xo}\langle T_{xo}\rangle \\ = \; & N_{ox}T_{ox}(1+\tau_{ox}) + N_{xo}T_{xo}(1+\tau_{xo}) \\ = \; & (N_{ox}T_{ox}+N_{xo}T_{xo})(1+\tau_J). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the relation between these two quantities τ_{ox} and τ_{xo}

$$|N_{ox}T_{ox}\tau_{ox}+N_{xo}T_{xo}\tau_{xo}| \leq n_\tau\sqrt{N_{ox}T_{ox}+N_{xo}T_{xo}}. \tag{33}$$

Here we have used Eq.(32). Similarly, the relation between any two different quantities $\tau_{l_1r_1}$ and $\tau_{l_2r_2}$ can be written into

$$\begin{aligned} & |N_{l_1r_1}T_{l_1r_1}\tau_{l_1r_1}+N_{l_2r_2}T_{l_2r_2}\tau_{l_2r_2}| \\ & \leq n_\tau\sqrt{N_{l_1r_1}T_{l_1r_1}+N_{l_2r_2}T_{l_2r_2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

with l_1, r_1, l_2, r_2 each can be any one of o, x or y and $l_1r_1 \neq l_2r_2$.

Generally, we can group the successful events of a number of two-pulse sources together. To see it more clearly, we define the set

$$\mathbf{J} = \{lr|l, r = o, x, y\} \tag{35}$$

as the whole set of all possible two-pulse sources (in a certain basis) used by Alice and Bob in the protocol. Explicitly, $\mathbf{J} = \{oo, ox, xo, oy, yo, xx, xy, yx, yy\}$ in any basis. With this notation, we can write all the relations among τ_{lr} into

$$\left|\sum_{lr\in\mathcal{J}} N_{lr}T_{lr}\tau_{lr}\right| \leq n_\tau\sqrt{\sum_{lr\in\mathcal{J}} N_{lr}T_{lr}}, \tag{36}$$

for all nonempty $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ and

$$\sum_{lr\in\mathbf{J}} N_{lr}T_{lr}\tau_{lr} = 0. \tag{37}$$

The last equation is deduced from the fact that

$$\sum_{lr\in\mathbf{J}} N_{lr}\langle T_{lr}\rangle = \sum_{lr\in\mathbf{J}} N_{lr}T_{lr}.$$

Specifically, if set $\mathcal{J}$ contains only one element lr, then the relations presented in Eq.(36) is just the bound for τ_{lr} shown in Eq.(27). If set $\mathcal{J}$ contains two elements, say $\mathcal{J} = \{l_1r_1, l_2r_2\}$, then the relations presented in Eq.(36) is just the relation between two quantities $\tau_{l_1r_1}$ and $\tau_{l_2r_2}$ given by Eq.(34).

It should be noted that there are nine different τ_{lr} in Eq.(26) for this three-intensity protocol in each basis, if we consider all possible lr. Furthermore, in Eq.(36) and Eq.(37), there are $\sum_{k=2}^{9}\mathcal{C}_9^k = 2^9-9-1 = 502$ joint constraints and $\mathcal{C}_9^1 = 9$ boundary constraints for these nine quantities. It is a hard work to obtain an explicit formula to estimate the lower bound of $\langle t_{11}\rangle = \langle s_{11}\rangle\langle e_{11}\rangle$ from Eq.(25) with all these constraints. In the next subsection, we will present some explicit formulas to upper bound $\langle e_{11}\rangle$ and lower bound $\langle s_{11}\rangle$.

Similarly, all the relations among quantities δ_{lr} for all possible lr can be written into

$$\left|\sum_{lr\in\mathcal{J}} N_{lr}S_{lr}\delta_{lr}\right| \leq n_\delta\sqrt{\sum_{lr\in\mathcal{J}} N_{lr}S_{lr}}, \tag{38}$$

for all nonempty $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ and

$$\sum_{lr\in\mathbf{J}} N_{lr}S_{lr}\delta_{lr} = 0. \tag{39}$$

Specifically, if set $\mathcal{J}$ contains only one element lr, then the relations presented in Eq.(38) is just the bounds for each quantities δ_{lr} shown in Eq.(19).

B. Formulas for improved analysis of statistical fluctuations

Consider the upper bound of e_{11} first. As shown in Eq.(26), the mean value $\langle T_{lr}\rangle$ is a function of τ_{lr}. Replacing T_{lr} by its mean value $\langle T_{lr}\rangle$ in Eq.(13), we get a function about quantities τ_{lr}

$$e_{11}^f = (T_+^f - T_-^f)/(a_1 b_1 \underline{s}_{11}^f), \tag{40}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_+^f &= \hat{T}_+ + T_{xx}\tau_{xx} + a_0 b_0 T_{oo}\tau_{oo}, \\ T_-^f &= \hat{T}_- + a_0 T_{ox}\tau_{ox} + b_0 T_{xo}\tau_{xo}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\hat{T}_\pm$ being the constant factors given by Eq.(14), $\underline{s}_{11}^f$ being the lower bound of s_{11} that will be discussed below.

In order to obtain a proper estimation of the upper bound of e_{11} from the function e_{11}^f, we need to find out the worst case under the constraints about the quantities τ_{lr}. That is to say, we need maximize the function e_{11}^f of variables τ_{lr} under the constraints shown in Eqs.(36, 37). As discussed above, there are 502 joint constraints for quantities τ_{lr} in each basis for this protocol. In principle, one can solve this optimization problem by the linear programming (LP) method with all those 502 constraints being listed in Eqs.(36, 37). However, this will cost huge computation power in making full optimization of all parameters. Note that if we only use part of the constraints, the final key will be still secure but the key rate could be not the optimized result. Naturally, one may ask the question whether we can still obtain the optimized or almost optimized result if we only use a few of 502 constraints. The answer is yes. Actually, as shown below, most of the constrains take no effect to the key rate and they can be abandoned. Luckily, as we show below, we can greatly reduce the number of joint constraints to 11 or even fewer. Moreover, we can even obtain explicit formulas for the optimization problem.

Reconsidering the function e_{11}^f, we know that the signs in front of T_+^f and T_-^f are different. So we can treat the variables in T_+^f and T_-^f separately. That is to say, equivalently, the maximization of e_{11}^f can be divided into two simple problems that are the maximization of T_+^f and the minimization of T_-^f. In maximizing T_+^f, we only need to consider the sole joint constraint between variables τ_{xx} and τ_{oo}. Similarly, in minimizing T_-^f, we only need to consider the sole joint constraint between variables τ_{ox} and τ_{xo}. These optimization problems can be solved by using the LP method. Furthermore, we can solve the problem analytically with explicit formulas. We consider the maximization of T_+^f first. In this function, there are two variables τ_{xx} and τ_{oo}. So we only need to consider the joint constraint $N_{xx}T_{xx}\tau_{xx} + N_{oo}T_{oo}\tau_{oo} \le n_\tau\sqrt{N_{xx}T_{xx} + N_{oo}T_{oo}}$ and the bounds of τ_{xx}, τ_{oo} shown in Eq.(27). Explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_+^f \;\le\; & \hat{T}_+ + \frac{n_\tau a_0 b_0}{N_{oo}}\sqrt{N_{xx}T_{xx} + N_{oo}T_{oo}} \\ & + n_\tau\left(\frac{1}{N_{xx}} - \frac{a_0 b_0}{N_{oo}}\right)\sqrt{N_{xx}T_{xx}} \triangleq \overline{T}_+^{f_1}, \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

when $a_0 b_0 N_{xx} \le N_{oo}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} T_+^f \;\le\; & \hat{T}_+ + \frac{n_\tau}{N_{xx}}\sqrt{N_{xx}T_{xx} + N_{oo}T_{oo}} \\ & + n_\tau\left(\frac{a_0 b_0}{N_{oo}} - \frac{1}{N_{xx}}\right)\sqrt{N_{oo}T_{oo}} \triangleq \overline{T}_+^{f_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

otherwise.

Conclusively, according to Eq.(41) and Eq.(42), the upper bound of the function T_+^f can be defined as $\overline{T}_+^f = \overline{T}_+^{f_1}$ when $a_0 b_0 N_{xx} \le N_{oo}$ and $\overline{T}_+^f = \overline{T}_+^{f_2}$ otherwise. Furthermore, we can easily prove that the upper bound $\overline{T}_+^f$ is reachable. So $\overline{T}_+^f$ is just the maximum value of the function T_+^f under the joint constraints.

For convenience, we can write $\overline{T}_+^f$ uniformly by introducing the following notations

$$d_{xx} = 1/N_{xx}, \quad d_{oo} = a_0 b_0/N_{oo}.$$

Moreover, we use nature numbers $1, 2$ to indicate these two different subscripts xx and oo with ascending order of $d_k (k = 1, 2)$. That is to say, we use nature number $1, 2$ to indicate xx, oo respectively when $d_{xx} \le d_{oo}$, and to indicate oo, xx respectively when $d_{oo} \le d_{xx}$. With these preparations, we can write the maximum value of T_+^f uniformly

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_+^f &= \hat{T}_+ + n_\tau d_1\sqrt{N_1 T_1 + N_2 T_2} \\ &\quad + n_\tau(d_2 - d_1)\sqrt{N_2 T_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Similarly, we can minimize the function T_-^f with the boundary constraints $\tau_{ox} \ge -\overline{\tau}_{ox}$, $\tau_{xo} \ge -\overline{\tau}_{xo}$ and the joint constraint $N_{ox}T_{ox}\tau_{ox} + N_{xo}T_{xo}\tau_{xo} \ge -n_\tau\sqrt{N_{ox}T_{ox} + N_{xo}T_{xo}}$. In the symmetric case where $a_k = b_k$, $a'_k = b'_k$, and $N_{lr} = N_{rl}$, the minimum value of T_-^f can be easily obtained

$$T_-^f \ge \hat{T}_- - \frac{n_\tau a_0}{N_{ox}}\sqrt{N_{ox}T_{ox} + N_{xo}T_{xo}} \triangleq \underline{T}_-^f, \tag{44}$$

where we have used the symmetric conditions and the joint constraint between τ_{ox} and τ_{xo}. Generally, without the symmetric case assumption, we can write the minimum value of T_-^f into

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{T}_-^f &= \hat{T}_- - n_\tau d_1\sqrt{N_1 T_1 + N_2 T_2} \\ &\quad - n_\tau(d_2 - d_1)\sqrt{N_2 T_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where we use nature numbers $1, 2$ to indicate these two different subscripts ox, xo with ascending order of $d_k (k = 1, 2)$ and $d_{ox} = a_0/N_{ox}$, $d_{xo} = b_0/N_{xo}$.

With the maximum value $\overline{T}_+^f$ and the minimum value $\underline{T}_-^f$, we can define the upper bound of e_{11} with the following explicit formula

$$\overline{e}_{11}^f = (\overline{T}_+^f - \underline{T}_-^f)/(a_1 b_1 \underline{s}_{11}^f), \tag{46}$$

where $\overline{T}_+^f$ and $\underline{T}_-^f$ are defined in Eq.(43) and Eq.(45) respectively, $\underline{s}_{11}^f$ is the lower bound of s_{11} that will be studied in the coming.

Now we commit ourself to derive the explicit formula to estimate the lower bound of s_{11}. As is defined in Eq.(18), the mean values $\langle S_{lr}\rangle$ is the function of δ_{lr}. Replacing S_{lr} by its mean value $\langle S_{lr}\rangle$ in Eq.(7), we get a function about quantities δ_{lr}

$$s_{11}^{f_1} = \hat{\underline{s}}_{11}^{(1)} + (S_+^{f_1} - S_-^{f_1})/(a_1 a_1' \tilde{b}_{12}), \tag{47}$$

where $S_+^{f_1} = \mathcal{S}_+^{(1)}(S_{xx}\delta_{xx}, S_{oy}\delta_{oy}, S_{yo}\delta_{yo}, S_{oo}\delta_{oo})$, $S_-^{f_1} = \mathcal{S}_-^{(1)}(S_{yy}\delta_{yy}, S_{ox}\delta_{ox}, S_{xo}\delta_{xo})$ with $\mathcal{S}_+^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{S}_-^{(1)}$ being defined in Eqs.(8,9) respectively, and $\hat{\underline{s}}_{11}^{(1)}$ being the constant factor defined in Eq.(7).

To obtain the lower bound of s_{11} from this function $s_{11}^{f_1}$, we need to find out the worst case under the constraints about the quantities δ_{lr}. That is to say, we need minimize the function $s_{11}^{f_1}$ of variables δ_{lr} under the constraints shown in Eqs.(38,39). In the function $s_{11}^{f_1}$, we can see that the signs in front of $S_+^{f_1}$ and $S_-^{f_1}$ are different. So we can treat the variables in $S_+^{f_1}$ and $S_-^{f_1}$ separately. That is to say, equivalently, the minimization of $s_{11}^{f_1}$ can be divided into two simple problems that are the minimization of $S_+^{f_1}$ and the maximization of $S_-^{f_1}$. In minimizing $S_+^{f_1}$, we only need to consider the constraints among variables δ_{xx}, δ_{oy}, δ_{yo} and δ_{oo}. There are only 11 joint constraints in this LP problem. Similarly, in maximizing $S_-^{f_1}$, we only need to consider the constraints among variables δ_{yy}, δ_{ox} and δ_{xo}. Here there are only 4 joint constraints.

Similar to the upper bound of e_{11}, we can also lower bound s_{11} analytically. For clarity, we introduce the following theorem

Theorem 1 *Consider the $K-$variable linear function $f(x_k) = \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k x_k$ with $x_k (k = 1, 2, \cdots, K; K \leq 4)$ and the following linear constraints*

$$\left|\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} \beta_k x_k\right| \leq n_0 \sqrt{\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} \beta_k}, \quad \mathcal{K} \subseteq \{1, 2, \cdots, K\} \tag{48}$$

where $n_0 \geq 0$ and $\alpha_k, \beta_k \geq 0$ $(k = 1, 2, \cdots, K)$. The maximum value of $f(x_k)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} f_{max} &= f(\tilde{x}_k^*) = \mathcal{F}(K, n_0, V_\alpha, V_\beta) \\ &= n_0 \sum_{k=1}^K (\tilde{\gamma}_n - \tilde{\gamma}_{n-1}) \sqrt{\sum_{k=n}^K \tilde{\beta}_n}, \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

with

$$\tilde{x}_k^* = \frac{n_0}{\tilde{\beta}_k} \left(\sqrt{\sum_{n=k}^K \tilde{\beta}_n} - \sqrt{\sum_{n=k+1}^K \tilde{\beta}_n} \right), (k = 1, \cdots, K) \tag{50}$$

and the minimum value of $f(x_k)$ is

$$f_{min} = -f_{max} = f(-\tilde{x}_k^*) = -\mathcal{F}(K, n_0, V_\alpha, V_\beta) \tag{51}$$

given the following notations: 1, $V_\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_K]$, $V_\beta = [\beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots, \beta_K]$, $\tilde{\gamma}_0 = 0$, $\gamma_k = \alpha_k/\beta_k$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ is the k-th minimum value of $\{\gamma_k | k = 1, 2, \cdots, K\}$ which means that we use $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ to denote the values of $\{\gamma_k\}$ with ascending order. 2, $\tilde{\zeta}_k$ is the rearrangement of $\zeta_k (\zeta = \alpha, \beta, x)$ so that $\tilde{\gamma}_k = \tilde{\alpha}_k/\tilde{\beta}_k (k = 1, 2, \cdots, K)$.

In Eq.(48), we use $\mathcal{K}$ to denote the subsects of $\{1, 2, \cdots, K\}$. Then we know that there are $\sum_{k=2}^K \mathcal{C}_K^k$ joint constraints and $\mathcal{C}_K^1 = K$ boundary constraints about $x_k (k = 1, 2, \cdots, K)$. For example, in the case with $K = 4$, we have 11 joint constraints such as $|\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_4 x_4| \leq n_0\sqrt{\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_4}$ with $\mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, 4\}$ and 4 boundary constraints such as $|x_1| \leq n_0/\sqrt{\beta_1}$ with $\mathcal{K} = \{1\}$. Actually, the value f_{max} is an upper bound of the function $f(x_k)$. On the other hand, we can prove that the point $P_s = (\tilde{x}_1^*, \tilde{x}_2^*, \tilde{x}_3^*, \tilde{x}_4^*)$ locates in the feasible region. Details of the proof of this theorem can be see in Appendix A.

By using the conclusion shown in Theorem 1 with $K = 2$, we can easily find out the maximum value of T_+^f and the minimum value of T_-^f. These values have been shown above in Eq.(43) and Eq.(45) respectively.

As discussed above, the function $S_+^{f_1}$ contains four variables δ_{xx}, δ_{oy}, δ_{yo} and δ_{oo}. In order to find out the minimum value of $S_+^{f_1}$ with the constraints shown in Eq.(38), we can use Theorem 1 with $K = 4$ directly. Explicitly, we have

$$S_+^{f_1} \geq -\mathcal{F}(4, n_\delta, V_\alpha^+, V_\beta^+) \triangleq \underline{S}_+^{f_1}, \tag{52}$$

where the function $\mathcal{F}$ is defined in Eq.(49) and $V_\alpha^+ = [a_1' b_2' S_{xx}, a_1 b_2 a_0' S_{oy}, a_1 b_2 b_0' S_{yo}, (a_1' b_2' a_0 b_0 - a_1 b_2 a_0' b_0') S_{oo}]$, $V_\beta^+ = [N_{xx} S_{xx}, N_{oy} S_{oy}, N_{yo} S_{yo}, N_{oo} S_{oo}]$.

Similarly, for the function $S_-^{f_1}$ with three variables δ_{yy}, δ_{ox} and δ_{xo}, we can estimate the maximum value of it by using Theorem 1 with $K = 3$

$$S_-^{f_1} \leq \mathcal{F}(3, n_\delta, V_\alpha^-, V_\beta^-) \triangleq \overline{S}_-^{f_1}, \tag{53}$$

where the function $\mathcal{F}$ is defined in Eq.(49) and $V_\alpha^- = [a_1 b_2 S_{yy}, a_1' b_2' a_0 S_{ox}, a_1' b_2' b_0 S_{xo}]$, $V_\beta^- = [N_{yy} S_{yy}, N_{ox} S_{ox}, N_{xo} S_{xo}]$.

After these preparations, we obtain a lower bound of s_{11} with the explicit formula

$$\underline{s}_{11}^{f_1} = \hat{s}_{11}^{(1)} + (\underline{S}_+^{f_1} - \overline{S}_-^{f_1})/(a_1 a_1' \tilde{b}_{12}), \tag{54}$$

where $\hat{s}_{11}^{(1)}$ is defined in Eq.(7), $\underline{S}_{+}^{f_1}$ is the minimum values of $S_{+}^{f_1}$, $\overline{S}_{-}^{f_1}$ is the maximum values of $S_{-}^{f_1}$ which are shown in Eqs.(52,53) respectively.

Besides the lower bound $\underline{s}_{11}^{f_1}$, we can obtain another lower bound of s_{11} corresponding to $\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)}$ shown in Eq.(10). Replacing S_{lr} by its mean value $\langle S_{lr}\rangle$ in Eq.(10), we get a function about quantities δ_{lr}

$$s_{11}^{f_2} = \underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)} + \frac{S_{+}^{f_2} - S_{-}^{f_2}}{a_1 b_1 \tilde{a}_{12}\tilde{b}_{12}}, \tag{55}$$

where $\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)}$ is a constant factor given by Eq.(10), $\tilde{a}_{12} = a_1 a_2' - a_1' a_2$, $\tilde{b}_{12} = b_1 b_2' - b_1' b_2$ and $S_{+}^{f_2} = \mathcal{S}_{+}^{(2)}(S_{xx}\delta_{xx}, S_{oy}\delta_{oy}, S_{yo}\delta_{yo}, S_{oo}\delta_{oo})$, $S_{-}^{f_2} = \mathcal{S}_{-}^{(2)}(S_{xy}\delta_{xy}, S_{yx}\delta_{yx}, S_{ox}\delta_{ox}, S_{xo}\delta_{xo})$ with $\mathcal{S}_{+}^{(2)}$, $\mathcal{S}_{-}^{(2)}$ being defined in Eqs.(11,12) respectively.

Similarly to the lower bound of $\underline{s}_{11}^{f_1}$, we need to find out the minimum value of $S_{+}^{f_2}$ and the maximum value of $S_{-}^{f_2}$ with the constraints shown in Eq.(38).

Using theorem 1, we can also find out the explicit formulas for the minimum of $S_{+}^{f_2}$ and maximum of $S_{-}^{f_2}$ analytically

$$S_{+}^{f_2} \geq -\mathcal{F}(4, n_\delta, W_\alpha^{+}, W_\beta^{+}) \triangleq \underline{S}_{+}^{f_2}, \tag{56}$$

$$S_{-}^{f_2} \leq \mathcal{F}(4, n_\delta, W_\alpha^{-}, W_\beta^{-}) \triangleq \overline{S}_{-}^{f_2}, \tag{57}$$

where the function $\mathcal{F}$ is defined in Eq.(49) and $W_\alpha^{+} = [g_{xx}S_{xx}, g_{oy}S_{oy}, g_{yo}S_{yo}, g_{oo}S_{oo}]$, $W_\beta^{+} = V_\beta^{+}$, $W_\alpha^{-} = [g_{xy}S_{xy}, g_{yx}S_{yx}, g_{ox}S_{ox}, g_{xo}S_{xo}]$, $W_\beta^{-} = [N_{xy}S_{xy}, N_{yx}S_{yx}, N_{ox}S_{ox}, N_{xo}S_{xo}]$.

With these estimations, we can write the other lower bound of s_{11} into the explicit formula

$$\underline{s}_{11}^{f_2} = \underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)} + \frac{\underline{S}_{+}^{f_2} - \overline{S}_{-}^{f_2}}{a_1 b_1 \tilde{a}_{12}\tilde{b}_{12}}, \tag{58}$$

where $\underline{\hat{s}}_{11}^{(2)}$ is a constant factor defined by Eq.(10), $\underline{S}_{+}^{f_2}$ is the minimum value of $S_{+}^{f_2}$ and $\overline{S}_{-}^{f_2}$ is the maximum value of $S_{-}^{f_2}$ which are defined in Eqs.(56,57) respectively.

Combining these two lower bounds, we obtain our improved estimation of the lower bound of s_{11}. Explicitly, we define

$$\underline{s}_{11}^{f} = \max\{\underline{s}_{11}^{f_1}, \underline{s}_{11}^{f_2}\}, \tag{59}$$

where $\underline{s}_{11}^{f_1}$ and $\underline{s}_{11}^{f_2}$ are defined in Eq.(54) and Eq.(58) respectively.

So far we have completed our analytical formulas. As discussed above, result of our analytical method is the same with that of the LP method which fully uses all those 502 joint constraints.

IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

In this section, we will present some results of numerical simulations. We treat the statistical fluctuation jointly as studied earlier in this paper. We also optimize all parameters by the method of full optimization[36]. We shall compare our results with Ref.[36], which has proposed the method of full optimization and has presented obviously the best result among all prior art works. We shall also compare our results with the result obtained by what we called *Traditional* method, i.e., optimizing all parameters but treating the statistical fluctuations of different sources *separately*. Without any loss of generality, we focus on the symmetric case where the two channel transmissions from Alice to UTP and from Bob to UTP are equal. Therefore we set $p_l = p_r$ and also $p_{X|l} = p_{X|r}$ for any $l = r$. We also assume that the UTP's detectors are identical, i.e., they have the same dark count rates and detection efficiencies, and their detection efficiencies do not depend on the incoming signals. We shall estimate what values would be probably observed for the yields and error yields in the normal cases by the linear channel loss model as in [5, 19, 25, 35]. For a fair comparison, we use the same experimental parameters used in Ref.[36] for our numerical simulation, which are mostly from the long-distance QKD experiment reported in [38]. The values of these parameters are listed in Table I. With this, the yields S_{lr} and error yields T_{lr} can be calculated [35] with coherent states with intensities μ_o, μ_x, μ_y. The density matrix of the coherent state with intensity μ can be written into $\rho = \sum_k \frac{e^{-\mu}\mu^k}{k!}|k\rangle\langle k|$. By using these values, we can estimate the lower bounds of s_{11}^Z and the upper bounds of e_{11}^X with different methods presented in the above sections. With these preparations, we can calculate the final secret key rate with the following formula [19]

$$R = \frac{1}{2}p_y^2 p_{Z|y}^2 a_1' b_1' s_{11}^Z[1 - H(e_{11}^X)] - f_e S_{yy}^Z H(E_{yy}^Z), \tag{60}$$

where S_{yy}^Z and E_{yy}^Z denote, respectively, the yield and error rate in Z-basis when Alice uses y_A and Bob uses y_B; f_e is the efficiency factor of the error correction method used; s_{11}^Z and e_{11}^X are the yield and error rate when both Alice and Bob send single-photon states.

To make a fair comparison, we need to find out the full parameter optimizations for different methods [36]. Here we also use the well-known local search algorithm. In this algorithm, we need to optimize the one-variable nonlinear function in each step for the local search.

We consider the three-intensity protocol in the case of

e_0	e_d	p_d	η_d	f_e	ϵ
0.5	1.5%	6.02×10^{-6}	14.5%	1.16	1.0×10^{-7}

TABLE I: List of experimental parameters used in numerical simulations. e_0 is the error rate of background. e_d is the misalignment-error probability. p_d is the dark count rate. η_d is the detection efficiency of all detectors. f_e is the error correction inefficiency. ϵ is the security bound considered in the finite-date analysis.

data-size $N_t = 10^{12}$. The optimal parameters and the practical key rate per pulse for the distance 50km (standard fiber), with the statistical fluctuations, are shown in Table II. The result presented in Ref.[36] is shown in the 2nd column. In the 3rd column, we show the optimal parameters after a full parameter optimization by using the traditional analytical method with Eq.(24) and Eq.(28). In the 4th column, we present the results after a full parameter optimization by using the improved analytical method with explicit formulas in Eq.(59) and Eq.(46). We can see that our new optimal key rate with full parameter optimization is better than the result presented in Ref.[36]. The improvement of the optimal final key rate R is about 97%. In Ref.[36], the lowest intensity is 10^{-6} which is too small to be obtained exactly in real experimental. On the other hand, the optimal key rates obtained by setting the lowest intensity to be 0 or 10^{-6} respectively are nearly equal to each other. Furthermore, the improved method considered in this paper can apply to the generalized situation that the lowest intensity is not 0 [33]. In Table III, we show the optimal parameters and the practical key rate per pulse for the distance 100km (standard fiber) with the statistical fluctuations. In the 2nd, 3rd and 4th columns, we present the results after a full parameter optimization by using the traditional method, the improved method with formulas and the LP method with all joint constraints for statistical fluctuations. We can see that our new full parameter optimization can improve the key rate R by 146%.

More extensive comparison results are shown in Fig.1. In this figure, we show the optimal key rate (per pulse) in logarithmic scale as a function of the distance under a practical setting with finite data-set $N_t = 10^{12}$.

Parameter	Ref.[36]	Traditional	Improved
μ_y	0.25	0.396	0.401
μ_x	0.05	0.056	0.055
μ_o	1.0×10^{-6}	0	0
p_y	0.58	0.646	0.681
p_x	0.30	0.256	0.243
$p_{X\|y}$	0.03	0.024	0.013
$p_{X\|x}$	0.71	0.737	0.709
$p_{X\|o}$	0.83	1.000	1.000
R	1.68×10^{-6}	2.59×10^{-6}	3.31×10^{-6}

TABLE II: Comparison of parameters at 50kms (standard fiber) for three-intensity protocol with statistical fluctuation analysis in the case of data-size (total number of pulse pairs) $N_t = 10^{12}$. The 2nd column is the result presented in Ref.[36]. The 3rd column is the optimal parameters after a full parameter optimization with explicit formulas Eq.(24) and Eq.(28). The 4th column is the optimal parameters obtained with explicit formulas Eq.(59) and Eq.(46). Comparing with the result given by Xu et al[36], our improved result raises the key rate R by 97%. We set the same probabilities for Alice and Bob in choosing sources and bases, p_x, p_y: probabilities to choose source x and y; $p_{X|y}$, $p_{X|x}$, $p_{X|o}$: probabilities of choosing $X-$basis selection conditional on sources y, x and o. Note that in Ref.[36], source o is not strict vacuum.

Parameter	Traditional	Improved I	Improved II
μ_y	0.269	0.275	0.275
μ_x	0.067	0.068	0.068
p_y	0.336	0.404	0.404
p_x	0.477	0.447	0.447
$p_{X\|y}$	0.132	0.084	0.084
$p_{X\|x}$	0.742	0.719	0.720
R	1.00×10^{-8}	2.46×10^{-8}	2.46×10^{-8}

TABLE III: Comparison of parameters at 100kms (standard fiber) for three-intensity protocol with statistical fluctuation analysis with $N_t = 10^{12}$. The 2nd column is the optimal parameters after a full parameter optimization with explicit formulas Eq.(24) and Eq.(28). The 3rd column is the optimal parameters obtained by our improved method with explicit formulas Eq.(59) and Eq.(46). The 4th column is the optimal parameters obtained by the LP method with all 502 joint constraints. We can see that our new full parameter optimization can improve the key rate R by 146%. The results obtained by using the numerical method and analytical methods are near equal to each other.

V. CONCLUSION

Through studying the statistical fluctuations of different sources jointly, we obtain the improved statistical analysis with explicit formulas. Numerical simulation shows that the results obtained from our improved methods are significantly better than the results obtained with the traditional methods treating statistical fluctuations of each sources separately. In our study, we have taken the same intensities in both bases. The result can be further improved by taking different intensities in different bases and taking the decoy-state method in only one basis as pointed out in [32]. This will be reported elsewhere.

Acknowledgement We acknowledge the financial support in part by the 10000-Plan of Shandong province, and the National High-Tech Program of China grant No. 2011AA010800 and 2011AA010803, NSFC grant No. 11474182, 11174177 and 60725416.



FIG. 1: (Color online) Optimal secret key rate (per pulse) as a function of the distance under different methods of three-intensity decoy-state protocol. Here we set $N_t = 10^{12}$. Dashed curve: key rates obtained through traditional full optimization with simple worst-case treatment for fluctuations in Eq.(24) and Eq.(28); Dashed-dotted curve: results from the LP method which fully used all 502 joint constraints of fluctuations; Solid curve: key rates from our formulas Eq.(59) and Eq.(46) with joint treatment of fluctuations. In the simulation, we have taken a full parameter optimization for all points.

Appendix A: The proof of Theorem 1

In section III, we need to use the conclusion of Theorem 1 with $K = 2, 3, 4$. Actually, we only need to prove the result with $K = 4$ since the cases with $K = 2, 3$ can be treated as the special case with $K = 4$. Furthermore, we only need to prove the situation in maximizing $f(x_k)$.

First, we show that the value f_{max} defined in Eq.(49) is an upper bound of the function $f(x_k)$. Actually, the function $f(x_k)$ can be written into

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_k) &= \sum_{k=1}^{4} \gamma_k \beta_k x_k = \sum_{k=1}^{4} \tilde{\gamma}_k \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{4} (\tilde{\gamma}_n - \tilde{\gamma}_{n-1}) \sum_{k=1}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k, \end{aligned}$$

where γ_k, $\tilde{\gamma}_k$, $\tilde{\alpha}_k$, $\tilde{\beta}_k$ and $\tilde{x}_k$ are defined in Theorem 1. Accordingly, we know that $\tilde{\gamma}_1 \le \tilde{\gamma}_2 \le \tilde{\gamma}_3 \le \tilde{\gamma}_4$. So we have $\tilde{\gamma}_n - \tilde{\gamma}_{n-1} \ge 0$ $(n = 1, 2, 3, 4)$. On the other hand, we know that $\sum_{k=n}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k \le n_0 \sqrt{\sum_{k=n}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k}$ with the constraints shown in Eq.(48). Then we can conclude that

$$f(x_k) \le n_0 \sum_{n=1}^{4} (\tilde{\gamma}_n - \tilde{\gamma}_{n-1}) \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k} = f_{max}.$$

Secondly, we prove that the upper bound f_{max} is reachable. As discussed above, we have used four constraints $\sum_{k=n}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k \le n_0 \sqrt{\sum_{k=n}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k}$ $(n = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ in obtaining the upper bound f_{max}. Then we can solve the linear systems $\sum_{k=n}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k = n_0 \sqrt{\sum_{k=n}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_k}$ $(n = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ about variables $\tilde{x}_k$ with

$$\tilde{x}_k^* = \frac{n_0}{\tilde{\beta}_k} \left(\sqrt{\sum_{n=k}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_n} - \sqrt{\sum_{n=k+1}^{4} \tilde{\beta}_n} \right), \ (k = 1, 2, 3, 4).$$

In order to prove the upper bound $f_{max} = f(\tilde{x}_k^*)$ is reachable, we only need to show that the point $P_s = (\tilde{x}_1^*, \tilde{x}_2^*, \tilde{x}_3^*, \tilde{x}_4^*)$ locates in the feasible region. That is to say, we need to prove that all the constraints presented in Eq.(48) with $K = 4$ are fulfilled when $\tilde{x}_k = \tilde{x}_k^*$. Equivalently, the constraints in Eq.(48) with $K = 4$ can be rewritten into

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k \le n_0 \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \tilde{\beta}_k}, \quad \mathcal{K} \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4\}. \tag{A1}$$

There are $\sum_{k=1}^{4} \mathcal{C}_4^k = 15$ constraints in Eq.(A1). In the following, we will group these 15 cases into 4 situations. In the first situation, we consider the constraints with $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_n^{(1)} (n = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1^{(1)} = \{4\}$, $\mathcal{K}_2^{(1)} = \{3, 4\}$, $\mathcal{K}_3^{(1)} = \{2, 3, 4\}$, $\mathcal{K}_4^{(1)} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. In this situation, we can easily calculate that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n^{(1)}} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k = n_0 \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n^{(1)}} \tilde{\beta}_k}, \quad (n = 1, 2, 3, 4).$$

In the second situation, we consider the constraints with $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_n^{(2)} (n = 1, 2, \cdots, 6)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1^{(2)} = \{1\}$, $\mathcal{K}_2^{(2)} = \{2\}$, $\mathcal{K}_3^{(2)} = \{3\}$, $\mathcal{K}_4^{(2)} = \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{K}_5^{(2)} = \{2, 3\}$, $\mathcal{K}_6^{(2)} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. In this situation, the following mean value theorem should be used

$$\sqrt{y_1 + y_2} \le \sqrt{y_1} + \sqrt{y_2}, \quad (y_1, y_2 \ge 0).$$

Taking $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_5^{(2)}$ as an example, we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_5^{(2)}} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k = n_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} - n_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_4} \le n_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3}.$$

We can also prove the other cases in the same way.

In the third situation, we consider the constraints with $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_n^{(3)} (n = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $\mathcal{K}_1^{(3)} = \{1, 4\}$, $\mathcal{K}_2^{(3)} = \{2, 4\}$, $\mathcal{K}_3^{(3)} = \{1, 2, 4\}$, $\mathcal{K}_4^{(3)} = \{1, 3, 4\}$. In this situation, we need the following lemma

Lemma 1 *Given four nonnegative variables y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 and $y_1 + y_2 = z_1 + z_2$, we have*

$$\sqrt{y_1} + \sqrt{y_2} \le \sqrt{z_1} + \sqrt{z_2}, \tag{A2}$$

if and only if $|y_1 - y_2| \ge |z_1 - z_2|$.

Proof: Denote $y_1 + y_2 = z_1 + z_2 = c_0$. We can easily prove that $y_1 y_2 \leq z_1 z_2$ if and only if $|y_1 - c_0/2| \geq |z_1 - c_0/2|$. On the other hand, $\sqrt{y_1} + \sqrt{y_2} \leq \sqrt{z_1} + \sqrt{z_2}$ if and only if $y_1 y_2 \leq z_1 z_2$ when $y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 \geq 0$ and $y_1 + y_2 = z_1 + z_2$. Furthermore, we know that $|y_1 - c_0/2| \geq |z_1 - c_0/2|$ if and only if $|y_1 - y_2| \geq |z_1 - z_2|$ when $y_1 + y_2 = z_1 + z_2 = c_0$. This complete the proof of Lemma 1.

With the conclusion presented in Lemma 1, we can easily prove the constraints are fulfilled in this situation. Taking $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_2^{(3)}$ as an example, we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_2^{(3)}} \tilde{\beta}_k \tilde{x}_k = n_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} - n_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} + n_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_4} \leq n_0 \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_4}.$$

As defined above, $\tilde{\beta}_k \geq 0 (k = 1, 2, 3, 4)$. In the last inequality, we have used Lemma 1 with $y_1 = \tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4$, $y_2 = \tilde{\beta}_4$ and $z_1 = \tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_4$, $z_2 = \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4$.

In the last situation, there is only one constraint remained with $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_1^{(4)} = \{1, 3\}$. We need to prove that $\sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_1 + \tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} - \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} + \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} - \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_4} \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_1 + \tilde{\beta}_3}$. Equivalently, we need to show that $\sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_1 + \tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} + \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} \leq \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_2 + \tilde{\beta}_3 + \tilde{\beta}_4} + \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_1 + \tilde{\beta}_3} + \sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_4}$. We can easily prove this inequality by taking squares of two sides twice with eliminating the same terms on the two sides in each step.

Conclusively, the upper bound f_{max} is reachable with P_s locates in the feasible region of the LP problem. That is to say, f_{max} is really the maximum value of $f(\tilde{x}_k)$ with $\tilde{x}_k = \tilde{x}_k^*$. Similarly, we know that the minimum value of $f(x_k)$ is $f_{min} = f(-\tilde{x}_k^*) = -f_{max}$. This complete the proof of Theorem 1 with $K = 4$. The conclusions with $K = 2, 3$ can be proved in the same way.

[1] C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing* (IEEE, New York, 1984), pp. 175-179.

[2] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 145 (2002); N. Gisin and R. Thew, Nature Photonics, **1**, 165 (2006); M. Dusek, N. Lütkenhaus, M. Hendrych, in *Progress in Optics VVVX*, edited by E. Wolf (Elsevier, 2006); V. Scarani, H. Bechmann-Pasqunucci, N.J. Cerf, *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1301 (2009).

[3] H. Inamori, N. Lütkenhaus, and D. Mayers, European Physical Journal D, **41**, 599 (2007), which appeared in the arXiv as quant-ph/0107017; D. Gottesman, H.K. Lo, N. Lütkenhaus, *et al.*, Quantum Inf. Comput. **4**, 325 (2004).

[4] W.-Y. Hwang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 057901 (2003).

[5] X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230503 (2005).

[6] X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012322 (2005).

[7] H.-K. Lo, X. Ma, and K. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 230504 (2005); X. Ma, B. Qi, Y. Zhao, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012326 (2005).

[8] Y. Adachi, T. Yamamoto, M. Koashi, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 180503 (2007).

[9] M. Hayashi, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 022307 (2006); ibid **76**, 012329 (2007).

[10] D. Rosenberg, J.W. Harrington, P.R. Rice, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 010503 (2007); T. Schmitt-Manderbach, H. Weier, M. Rürst, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 010504 (2007); C.-Z. Peng, J. Zhang, D. Yang, *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 010505 (2007); Z.-L. Yuan, A. W. Sharpe, and A. J. Shields, Appl. Phys. Lett. **90**, 011118 (2007); Y. Zhao, B. Qi, X. Ma, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 070502 (2006); Y. Zhao, B. Qi, X. Ma, *et al.*, in *Proceedings of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, Seattle* (IEEE, New York, 2006), pp. 2094–2098.

[11] X.-B. Wang, C.-Z. Peng, J. Zhang, *et al.* Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042311 (2008); J.-Z. Hu and X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A, **82**, 012331(2010).

[12] X.-B. Wang, T. Hiroshima, A. Tomita, *et al.*, Physics Reports **448**, 1(2007).

[13] X.-B. Wang, L. Yang, C.-Z. Peng, *et al.*, New J. Phys. **11**, 075006 (2009).

[14] G. Brassard, N. Lütkenhaus, T. Mor, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1330 (2000); N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052304 (2000); N. Lütkenhaus and M. Jahma, New J. Phys. **4**, 44 (2002).

[15] B. Huttner, N. Imoto, N. Gisin, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 1863 (1995); H.P. Yuen, Quantum Semiclassic. Opt. **8**, 939 (1996).

[16] L. Lyderson, V. Makarov, and J. Skaar, Nature Photonics, **4**, 686(2010); I. Gerhardt, L. Mai, A. Lamas-Linares, *et al.*, Nature Commu. **2**, 349 (2011)

[17] D. Mayers and A. C.-C. Yao, in *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS98)* (IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, 1998), p. 503; A. Acin, N. Brunner, N. Gisin, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 230501 (2007); V. Scarani, and R. Renner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 302008 (2008); V. Scarani, and R. Renner, in *3rd Workshop on Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2008)*, (University of Tokyo, Tokyo 30 JanC1 Feb 2008) See also arXiv:0806.0120

[18] S.L. Braunstein and S. Pirandola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 130502 (2012).

[19] H.-K. Lo, M. Curty, and B. Qi, Phys. Rev. Lett., **108**, 130503 (2012), K. Tamaki, H.-K. Lo, C.-H. F. Fung, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A, **85**, 042307 (2012).

[20] X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 012320 (2013).

[21] Phys. Rev. A 72, 049908 (2013)(Erratum of Ref.[20]).

[22] A. Rubenok, J. A. Slater, P. Chan, *et al.*, 1304.2463v1.

[23] P. Chan, J. A. Slater, I. Lucio-Martinez, *et al.*, arXiv:1204.0738v1.

[24] Y. Liu, T.-Y. Chen, L.-J. Wang, *et al.*, arXiv:1209.6178v1.

[25] X. Ma, C.-H. Fred Fung, and M. Razavi, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 052305 (2012).

[26] S.-H. Sun, M. Gao, C.-Y. Li, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **87**,

052329 (2013).
[27] S.-H. Sun, M. Gao, C.-Y. Li, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Phys. Rev. A **88**, 019905 (2013) (Erratum of Ref.[26]).
[28] Q. Wang and X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A, **88**, 052332 (2013).
[29] F. Xu, M. Curty, B. Qi, *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. 103, 061101 (2013).
[30] M. Curty, F. Xu, W. Cui, et al, arXiv:1307.1081v1.
[31] Z.-W. Yu, Y.-H. Zhou, and X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 062339 (2013).
[32] Z.-W. Yu, Y.-H. Zhou, and X.-B. Wang, arXiv: 1309.0471v1.
[33] Z.-W. Yu, Y.-H. Zhou, and X.-B. Wang, arXiv: 1309.5886v1.
[34] Y.-H. Zhou, Z.-W. Yu, and X.-B. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 052325 (2014).
[35] Q. Wang, and X.-B. Wang, *Scientific Reports*, 4, 4612(2014).
[36] F. Xu, H. Xu, and H.-K. Lo, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 052333 (2014).
[37] R.H. Byrd, J.C. Gilbert, and J. Nocedal, Mathematical Programming, **89(1)**, 149-185 (2000). R.A. Waltz, J.L. Morales, J. Nocedal, and D. Orban, Mathematical Programming, **107(3)**, 391-408 (2006).
[38] R. Ursin, F. Tiefenbacher, T. Schmitt-Manderbach, *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **3**, 481 (2007).